

## Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00482 01 OF 03 061519Z

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-07

IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05

PRS-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05 ERDA-05

ERDE-00 /090 W

-----090506 061534Z /42

P 061403Z OCT 77

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2367

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION USNATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 3 MBFR VIENNA 0482

FROM US MBFR REP

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM NATO

SUBJ: MBFR: SUMMARY OF OCT 4, 1977 INFORMAL SESSION

MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPS OF OCT 4, 1977

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: IN THE OCT 4, 1977 INFORMAL SESSION OF THE VIENNA TALKS, THE ALLIES WERE REPRESENTED BY THE CANADIAN REP, THE FRG REP AND THE US REP AND THE EAST BY SOVIET REPS TARASOV AND SHUSTOV, CZECHOSLOVAK REP MEISNER AND POLISH REP STRULAK. MILITARY ADVISORS ALSO PARTICIPATED.

2. EASTERN REPS GAVE FURTHER NEGATIVE REACTION TO WESTERN DATA PROPOSAL OF JULY 15, 1977, CLAIMING THAT AFTER DETAILED STUDY, EASTERN REPS COULD NOT STILL SEE HOW IT WOULD CONTRIBUTE TO REACHING AGREEMENT ON DATA. HOWEVER, THEY AVOIDED DIRECT REJECTION

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00482 01 OF 03 061519Z

OF PROPOSAL. EASTERN REPS PRESENTED CRITICISM OF WESTERN REDUCTION APPROACH AND URGED MERITS OF EQUAL PERCENTAGE REDUCTIONS AND EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL.

3. WESTERN REPS LISTED AREAS IN WHICH EAST SHOULD MOVE TOWARDS AGREEMENT, INCLUDING ACCEPTANCE OF WESTERN DATA DISAGGREGATION PROPOSAL, PARITY OF MANPOWER, COLLECTIVE MANPOWER LIMITATIONS

AND TAKING PROPER ACCOUNT OF IMPACT OF GEOGRAPHY. THEY EXPLAINED BACKGROUND OF WESTERN JULY PROPOSAL FOR MORE DETAILED EXCHANGE OF DATA AND SAID WEST CONTINUED TO HOPE FOR SERIOUS EASTERN RESPONSE TO WESTERN PROPOSAL OF DECEMBER 1975. IN CONNECTION WITH THE LATTER TOPIC, EASTERN REPS ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT THE NATURE OF THE LIMITATIONS WHICH WOULD BE IMPOSED ON US NUCLEAR ARMAMENTS AND SOVIET TANKS UNDER WESTERN DEC 1975 PROPOSAL.

4. CZECHOSLOVAK REP LED OFF WITH REVIEW OF DATA ISSUE. HE SAID THAT THE DATA TABLED BY BOTH SIDES "QUITE CONVINCINGLY" DEMONSTRATED THE EXISTENCE OF AN APPROXIMATE EQUILIBRIUM BETWEEN THE FORCES OF THE TWO MILITARY GROUPINGS AND CONFIRMED THE CORRECTNESS OF THE EAST'S EQUAL PERCENTAGE REDUCTION APPROACH. IN ORDER TO CONCEAL ITS UNDERLYING RELUCTANCE TO COME TO AGREEMENT ON REDUCTIONS, THE WEST HAD CLAIMED THE EAST'S DATA WAS DIFFERENT FROM WESTERN ESTIMATES, BUT THE WEST HAD BEEN UNABLE TO GIVE ANY ARGUMENTS OR EVIDENCE TO SUBSTANTIATE ITS FIGURES, WHICH WERE COMPLETELY WRONG AND INFLATED, AND OBVIOUSLY BASED ON ESTIMATES RATHER THAN HARD FACTS AND MOTIVATED BY THE DESIRE TO JUSTIFY THE CONCEPT OF ASYMMETRICAL REDUCTIONS. THE EAST HAD INCLUDED ALL UNIFORMED MILITARY PERSONNEL ON THE ROSTERS OF UNITS AND SUB-UNITS IN ITS FIGURES, EXCLUDING ONLY THE SAME TYPE OF PERSONNEL AS THE WEST HAD EXCLUDED FROM ITS OWN FIGURES. THE EAST HAD CAREFULLY STUDIED THE WESTERN PROPOSAL OF JULY 15, 1977 FOR FURTHER CONDUCT OF THE DATA DISCUSSION BUT HAD THUS FAR BEEN UNABLE TO FIND IN THESE PROPOSALS ANYTHING WHICH WOULD  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00482 01 OF 03 061519Z

CONTRIBUTE TO ELIMINATION OF THE DIFFERENCES ON FIGURES OR CONTRIBUTE TO SOLUTION OF REDUCTION ISSUES. THE EAST CONTINUED TO BELIEVE THE MOST EFFECTIVE WAY TO CLARIFY THE DIFFERENCES IN ESTIMATES WAS RECIPROCAL EXCHANGE OF DATA ON NATIONAL CONTINGENTS OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. THE EAST WAS PREPARED TO INCLUDE AVERAGE MANNING LEVELS OF ITS FORCES IN SUCH AN EXCHANGE. THE EAST WAS PREPARED TO CONTINUE DATA DISCUSSION ON CONDITION THAT IT WAS DIRECTLY RELATED TO SOLUTION OF THE ISSUE OF REDUCTIONS AND SERVED THE OBJECTIVE OF REACHING A GENERAL UNDERSTANDING ON FORCES TO BE REDUCED. BUT THE EAST OPPOSED CHANGING THE DATA DISCUSSION INTO DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE STRUCTURE OF ARMED FORCES, DESIGNATION OF INDIVIDUAL MILITARY FORMATIONS, THEIR NUMERICAL STRENGTH, LOCATION AND OTHER DETAILS NOT DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE OBJECTIVE OF AGREEMENT ON REDUCTIONS.

5. CANADIAN REP SAID WESTERN REPS STILL LOOKED FORWARD IN THE PRESENT ROUND TO A POSITIVE EASTERN RESPONSE TO THE COMPROMISE PROPOSALS MADE BY THE WEST ON TABLING FURTHER DATA FOR THE PURPOSE OF IDENTIFYING THE REASONS OF THE DISCREPANCY BETWEEN EASTERN AND WESTERN FIGURES ON EASTERN MILITARY MANPOWER. HE INVITED THE EAST TO SHOW NECESSARY REALISM ON THE ISSUES OF PARITY,

COLLECTIVE CEILINGS, SELECTIVE ARMAMENTS, AND OF TAKING INTO ACCOUNT IMPACT OF GEOGRAPHY ON OBLIGATIONS AND SAID THAT A SUBSTANTIVE EASTERN RESPONSE TO WESTERN PROPOSAL OF DEC 1975 WAS LONG OVERDUE.

6. POLISH REP PRESENTED CRITIQUE OF WESTERN REDUCTION APPROACH. HE CLAIMED THE MAIN CAUSE FOR LACK OF PROGRESS IN THE NEGOTIATIONS THUS FAR WAS THE WESTERN INSISTENCE THAT THE EAST SHOULD UNDERTAKE UNEQUAL REDUCTION COMMITMENTS. FOR EXAMPLE, THE WEST WANTED WITHDRAWAL OF A SOVIET TANK ARMY FROM A SPECIFIC LOCATION IN THE REDUCTION AREA TOGETHER WITH ITS ARMAMENTS AND EQUIPMENT WITHOUT IDENTIFYING COMMITMENTS OF EQUIVALENT VALUE AS TO REDUCTION OF WESTERN

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00482 02 OF 03 061522Z  
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-07  
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05  
PRS-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05 ERDA-05  
ERDE-00 /090 W

-----090578 061535Z /42

P 061403Z OCT 77

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2368

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION USNATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 3 MBFR VIENNA 0482

FROM US MBFR REPRESENTATIVE

FORMATIONS OF CONSIDERABLE SIZE TOGETHER WITH THEIR ARMAMENTS. THE WESTERN OPTION III PROPOSAL WAS NO SOLUTION. UNDER IT, THE NATO STATES OTHER THAN THE US WOULD RETAIN AN UNRESTRICTED POSSIBILITY OF BUILDING UP THEIR STOCKS OF NUCLEAR DELIVERY VEHICLES TO COMPENSATE FOR US REDUCTIONS. THE FACT THAT THE PROPOSED US WITHDRAWALS COVERED OUTDATED US NUCLEAR WEAPONS WAS UNDERLINED BY THE FACT THAT LEADING NATO CIRCLES WERE PLANNING TO DEPLOY TO CENTRAL EUROPE NEW AND MORE SOPHISTICATED WARHEADS AND MEANS OF DELIVERY INCLUDING

NEUTRON WARHEADS AND CRUISE MISSILES. POLISH REP CRITICIZED REFUSAL OF WEST TO ACCEPT ACROSS-THE-BOARD REDUCTION OF ARMAMENTS INCLUDING AIR FORCES AND UNITS EQUIPPED WITH NUCLEAR WEAPONS, AND REFUSAL OF WESTERN EUROPEAN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS AND CANADA TO UNDERTAKE BINDING OBLIGATIONS ON THEIR PHASE II REDUCTIONS, AND CHARGED THAT THE WEST WAS ASKING THE EAST TO REDUCE THREE TIMES MORE MANPOWER THAN THE WEST.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00482 02 OF 03 061522Z

7. FRG REP UNDERLINED THE IMPORTANCE WESTERN PARTICIPANTS ATTACHED TO THEIR JUNE 15 PROPOSAL TO TABLE MORE DETAILED DATA. AGREEMENT ON THE SIZE OF MILITARY MANPOWER ON BOTH SIDES WAS ESSENTIAL FOR AN AGREEMENT ON REDUCTION AND LIMITATIONS. BUT A BASIS FOR AGREEMENT ON DATA COULD NOT BE ATTAINED UNTIL THE REASONS FOR THE DISCREPANCY BETWEEN EASTERN AND WESTERN DATA ON EASTERN MILITARY MANPOWER HAD BEEN CLARIFIED. THE WESTERN PROPOSAL OFFERED EACH SIDE THE PROSPECT THAT A SINGLE RECIPROCAL EXCHANGE OF DATA COULD EFFECTIVELY AND IMMEDIATELY CONTRIBUTE TO THE OBJECTIVE OF IDENTIFYING WHERE THE DISCREPANCY BETWEEN EASTERN AND WESTERN DATA WAS TO BE FOUND AND THE EXTENT OF THAT DISCREPANCY. THE WEST DID NOT PROPOSE AN EXCHANGE OF DATA EITHER BY LOCATION OR FUNCTION NOR AN EXAMINATION OF ORGANIZATION FOR ITS OWN SAKE. THE WEST WAS PREPARED TO PROVIDE THE SAME TYPE OF DATA ON WESTERN FORCES IT WAS ASKING THE EAST TO PROVIDE.

8. TARASOV CHARGED THAT THE REFUSAL OF THE WESTERN PARTICIPANTS TO RELINQUISH THEIR UNREALISTIC POSITION OVER THE PAST FOUR YEARS EVIDENCED A DESIRE TO DRAG OUT THE NEGOTIATIONS. THE EASTERN EQUAL PERCENTAGE REDUCTION APPROACH ON THE OTHER HAND WOULD PERMIT ALL PARTICIPANTS TO CONTRIBUTE EQUALLY WITHOUT DISTURBING THE PRESENT RELATIONSHIP OF FORCES IN THE AREA. REDUCTION BY UNITS AND SUB-UNITS WITH THEIR ARMAMENTS WAS THE BEST WAY TO DEAL WITH THE ARMS RACE. THE EAST WAS PREPARED TO REDUCE IN STAGES IN RESPONSE TO WESTERN DESIRE, BUT THIS REQUIRED NON-US WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS TO UNDERTAKE AT LEAST IN A GENERAL FORM COMMITMENTS ON THE TIMING AND SCOPE OF THEIR PHASE II REDUCTIONS. TARASOV URGED THAT THE WEST RE-EXAMINE THE EASTERN FREEZE PROPOSAL.

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00482 02 OF 03 061522Z

9. THE US REP UNDERLINED THE IMPORTANCE WHICH THE WEST CONTINUES TO ATTACH TO ITS NUCLEAR WITHDRAWAL PROPOSAL OF

DECEMBER 16, 1975. HE DESCRIBED COMPONENT ELEMENTS OF THAT PROPOSAL. THIS OFFER, THE MOST IMPORTANT MOVE MADE IN THE NEGOTIATIONS THUS FAR, ADDED CONSIDERABLY TO THE BURDEN OF REDUCTIONS AND LIMITATIONS WHICH THE WEST WOULD HAVE UNDERTAKEN UNDER ITS ORIGINAL PROPOSALS. BUT THE EAST HAD THUS FAR MADE NO CHANGE IN THE MILITARY OUTCOME ENVISAGED BY ITS ORIGINAL PROPOSALS, NEITHER INCREASING ITS OWN OBLIGATIONS NOR DECREASING ITS DEMANDS ON THE WEST. WESTERN REPS HOPED THAT THE PRESENT ROUND WOULD BRING A POSITIVE EASTERN RESPONSE TO THE DECEMBER 1975 WESTERN PROPOSALS AS A TRUE INDICATION OF EASTERN INTEREST IN PROGRESS.

10. FOLLOWING ON US REPS' PRESENTATION, SOVIET REP TARASOV ASKED SEVERAL QUESTIONS ABOUT THE RESIDUAL LIMITATIONS WHICH WOULD RESULT FROM WEST'S DECEMBER 1975 PROPOSAL, WHICH MARK THE FIRST OCCASION ON WHICH EAST HAS ADDRESSED THIS TOPIC DIRECTLY IN INFORMAL SESSIONS. TARASOV ASKED WHETHER THE US WOULD UNDERTAKE TO LIMIT ALL US NUCLEAR WARHEADS AND ALL US NUCLEAR DELIVERY SYSTEMS IN THE REDUCTION AREA. US REP SAID LIMITS WOULD COVER OVERALL RESIDUAL LEVEL OF ALL US NUCLEAR WARHEADS AND RESIDUAL LEVELS OF THE TWO TYPES OF DELIVERY SYSTEMS TO BE WITHDRAWN. TARASOV ASKED WHETHER LIMITATION ON SOVIET TANKS WOULD COVER ONLY EXISTING SOVIET TANKS OR NEW MODELS. WESTERN REPS MADE CLEAR LIMITATIONS WOULD COVER FOLLOW-ON MODELS ON SOVIET MAIN BATTLE TANKS AS WELL AS ALL US NUCLEAR CAPABLE AIRCRAFT AND LONGER RANGE TACTICAL BALLISTIC MISSILES OF PERSHING TYPE IN THE AREA. END SUMMARY

11. IN VIEW OF POSSIBLE INTEREST OF WASHINGTON AGENCIES IN THIS DISCUSSION OF LIMITATIONS, WE ATTACH FULL TEXT OF THIS PORTION OF THE INFORMAL RECORD.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00482 03 OF 03 061522Z  
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-07  
IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-05  
PRS-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05 ERDA-05  
ERDE-00 /090 W

-----090589 061534Z /42

P 061403Z OCT 77

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2369

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION USNATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY  
AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY  
USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY  
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 3 VIENNA 0482

QUOTE 12. TARASOV SAID THAT, IN SPEAKING ABOUT THE WESTERN PROPOSAL OF DECEMBER 16, 1975, THE US REP HAD JUST NOTED THAT THAT PROPOSAL CONTAINED NOT ONLY A PROPOSAL OF A REDUCTION OF A CERTAIN NUMBER OF US NUCLEAR WARHEADS AND SOME OF THEIR DELIVERY SYSTEMS, BUT ALSO A PROPOSAL ON THE LIMITATION OF THOSE WEAPONS AT THEIR RESIDUAL LEVELS. IN THIS CONNECTION, THE SOVIET REP WISHED TO CLARIFY WHETHER THIS PROPOSAL PROVIDED FOR LIMITING ALL THE US NUCLEAR MUNITIONS IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS AND ALL THE US DELIVERY SYSTEMS DEPLOYED THERE, OR ONLY THE TYPES TO BE WITHDRAWN.

13. US REP SAID THAT, AS TO US NUCLEAR WARHEADS, THE WESTERN PROPOSAL WOULD COVER ALL TYPES OF US NUCLEAR WARHEADS IN THE AREA. THIS WAS THE FEATURE OF THE WESTERN PROPOSAL, AS HE HAD JUST MENTIONED, WHICH MADE CRITICISMS REGARDING ALLEGED OBSOLESCENCE OF US WARHEADS IRRELEVANT. WITH RESPECT TO DELIVERY SYSTEMS, THE WESTERN PROPOSAL WOULD COVER THE TWO  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00482 03 OF 03 061522Z

MOST SIGNIFICANT AND LONG RANGE US DELIVERY SYSTEMS IN THE AREA. IT DID NOT COVER OTHER  
US DELIVERY SYSTEMS IN THE AREA.

14. TARASOV SAID, AS HE UNDERSTOOD THE WESTERN PROPOSAL OF DECEMBER 16, 1975, THAT PROPOSAL DID NOT PROVIDE FOR ONE-SIDED REDUCTIONS OF US NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN CENTRAL EUROPE. AS HE UNDERSTOOD IT, THESE PROPOSALS WERE TIED TO THE REDUCTION OF CERTAIN ARMAMENTS AT THE DISPOSAL OF SOVIET ARMED FORCES IN THE REDUCTION AREA. COULD EASTERN REPS ASSUME THAT, ANALOGOUS TO THE EFFECTS OF THE WESTERN PROPOSAL IN LIMITING WITHDRAWN US ARMAMENTS, THAT LIMITS ON SOVIET TANKS WOULD COVER ONLY EXISTING TYPES OF SOVIET TANKS IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS AND THAT NEW TYPES OF TANKS COULD BE INTRODUCED WITHOUT ANY LIMITATION?

15. US REP, DRAWING ON GUIDANCE FROM THE NAC, SAID THIS QUESTION INDICATED THAT EASTERN REPS MISUNDERSTOOD THE SCOPE OF THE WESTERN PROPOSAL. THE WEST WAS NOT RESTRICTING LIMITATIONS ON RESIDUAL LEVELS MERELY TO THE SPECIFIC MODELS WITHDRAWN BUT

TO THAT TYPE OF DELIVERY SYSTEM. IN OTHER WORDS,  
IN THE CASE OF US AIRCRAFT, THE WEST PROPOSED THAT THE  
LIMIT APPLY TO ALL NUCLEAR CAPABLE US AIRCRAFT  
AND NOT ONLY TO US F-4'S. SIMILARLY, AS REGARDS  
THE TANK ISSUE RAISED BY THE SOVIETS REP, THE LIMITS WOULD BE  
APPLIED TO NEW, FOLLOW-ON MODELS OF SOVIET MAIN BATTLE TANKS  
INTRODUCED INTO THE AREA.

16. TARASOV SAID THAT, AS HE UNDERSTOOD THIS REPLY,  
THE US BALLISTIC MISSILE LAUNCHERS OF ALL TYPES WOULD BE  
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00482 03 OF 03 061522Z

LIMITED. FRG REP SAID THE WESTERN PROPOSAL DID NOT RPT  
NOT COVER US LAUNCHERS OF ALL RANGES. HOWEVER, THE PROPOSED  
LIMITATION WOULD COVER NOT ONLY PERSHING LAUNCHERS BUT ALSO  
SUCCESSOR MODELS OF THE SAME TYPE OF WEAPON. TARASOV SAID, THERE-  
FORE, THE PROPOSED LIMITATION WOULD NOT COVER ALL NUCLEAR MISSILE  
LAUNCHERS. US REP SAID THAT THIS UNDERSTANDING OF TARASOV'S  
WAS CORRECT. BUT WITH RESPECT TO THIS POINT, HE WISHED  
TO COMMENT THAT WESTERN PARTICIPANTS THOUGHT THAT THE  
TOTAL PACKAGE THE WEST WAS OFFERING WAS AT LEAST EQUAL  
TO WHAT THE WEST WAS ASKING THE EAST TO DO AND THAT  
TO ASK THE WEST TO ENLARGE THE SCOPE OF ITS REDUCTIONS  
AND LIMITATIONS OF NUCLEAR DELIVERY SYSTEMS WOULD BE  
ASKING THE WEST TO DIMINISH ITS SECURITY. IN THIS CONNECTION,  
WESTERN REPS HAD PARTICULARLY IN MIND THE FACT THAT SOVIET  
TERRITORY ADJOINED THE REDUCTION AREA AND THAT ON THAT SOVIET  
TERRITORY THERE WERE SIGNIFICANT NUMBERS OF NUCLEAR  
DELIVERY SYSTEMS WHICH WOULD NEITHER BE REDUCED NOR  
LIMITED BY AN AGREEMENT. UNQUOTE.RESOR

SECRET

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01-Jan-1994 12:00:00 am  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** REPORTS, ARMS CONTROL MEETINGS, REGIONAL DEFENSE ORGANIZATIONS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Sent Date:** 06-Oct-1977 12:00:00 am  
**Decaption Date:** 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 22 May 2009  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1977MBFRV00482  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Expiration:**  
**Film Number:** D770364-1269  
**Format:** TEL  
**From:** MBFR VIENNA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1977/newtext/t19771088/aaaacwmm.tel  
**Line Count:** 366  
**Litigation Code IDs:**  
**Litigation Codes:**  
**Litigation History:**  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Message ID:** 65498d35-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Office:** ACTION ACDA  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 7  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Retention:** 0  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 22-Nov-2004 12:00:00 am  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**SAS ID:** 1012611  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: SUMMARY OF OCT 4, 1977 INFORMAL SESSION MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPS OF OCT 4, 1977  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO  
**To:** STATE DOD  
**Type:** TE  
**vdkgvwkey:** odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS\_Docs/65498d35-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Review Markings:**  
Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
22 May 2009  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009